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ABSTRACT
The author, who is preparing an eclectic edition of Proverbs for the Oxford Hebrew Bible, discusses the special problems that Proverbs presents. Special issues are the nature of the textual resources (including the problematic LXX-Prov) and the definition of the task (which must aim at a hyparchetype, not an Urtext). The author explains his own concept of editorial practice with the aid of a survey of methodologies in use in Shakespearian text criticism. Appended is a sample chapter of OHB Proverbs.

There can be no edition of the work of a writer of former times which is satisfactory to all readers, though there might, I suppose, be at least half a dozen editions of the works of Shakespeare executed on quite different lines, each of which, to one group of readers, would be the best edition possible.

McKerrow 1939: 1

As the demand increases for the plays of Shakespeare, so new editors will arise—all with notions and new readings of their own,—till it will end perhaps by every intelligent man turning editor for himself.

(Anonymous reviewer, Athenaeum, 1853)

1. INTRODUCTION

I am preparing the Oxford Hebrew Bible edition of Proverbs. The purpose of the OHB, whose founder and general editor is Ronald Hendel, is to provide an eclectic text of the Bible, together with an introduction describing the textual resources and special problems of each book and followed by a commentary devoted to text-critical matters. Proverbs presents special conundrums to the text critic. I will discuss them briefly and explain the theoretical basis for my choices. There are two main issues to be addressed: the use of the problematic textual evidence and the

---

1 See http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/connotations/speva61.htm.
2 For a description of the project and samples, see http://ohb.berkeley.edu/. The website includes a statement of purpose and method by Hendel. A recent article by van Rooy (2004) discusses the project from the perspective of the editor of the Ezekiel volume.
definition of the task. To clarify both of these issues, I will bring examples from Shakespearian editorial practice.

2. TEXTUAL RESOURCES

The resources for the textual criticism of Proverbs are skimpy and problematic. In Hebrew, besides the MT, there are two fragments of two texts from Qumran Cave 4 (4QProva a, b) with four variants (Ulrich 2003: 180-86), only one of them valid, in my view. There are no significant consonantal variants in the Aleppo Codex, though there are a couple of inner Masoretic variants elsewhere that will be noted and, in one case at least ("earth," in 8:16), preferred.

Of the ancient translations, the Targum and Vulgate have very marginal value for reconstructing a non-Masoretic text of Proverbs, since both are heavily dependent on other sources, though occasionally the Vulgate confirms a variant independently of the LXX. The Peshitta negotiates between the Hebrew and the Greek, often in unpredictable ways, but in a number of cases it provides independent evidence for a Hebrew variant and can support the LXX independently.

The most important repository of textual variants for Proverbs is the LXX, but recovering them presents special difficulties. As is well known, LXX-Prov is often—though not consistently—a free, dynamic rendering. It is full of divergences from the MT, some radical, and it is hard to know which were present in the LXX's source text and which arose in the course of translation.

In a series of books and articles, Johann Cook has developed the thesis that this translation is a Jewish Hellenistic document that is both interpretive and religiously conservative. While basically agreeing with this description, I am more optimistic than Cook (and probably most scholars) about the possibility of retrieving Hebrew variants from LXX-Prov. I explore some ways for doing so in a recent article (Fox 2005). In principle, since the LXX descended from the same ancestor as the MT at some stage, the LXX can be expected to witness to the shared ancestral text from which the MT diverged. LXX-Prov witnesses to a fair number of Hebrew variants, some of them valid, others just wrong. I will embed Septuagintal variants in the eclectic text only when I believe that they are what should have been preserved in the MT tradition, prior to errors or

---

3 Cook's bibliography on the topic is too massive to list here. His main work is his 1997 study of Prov 1-9. Two recent works of special relevance are 2001 and 2003.
some types of scribal meddling. A good example of a retrievable variant is Prov 21:20:

A delightful storehouse and oil are in the habitation of the wise, but a stupid man swallows (his) up.

"Oil" is not coordinate with "a delightful treasure" and forms a lopsided pairing. Moreover, there would be no point in separating oil from the other items in the storehouse. It is possible to make sense of the MT. It is always possible to make sense of the MT. But at a certain point doing so requires such ingenuity so that it becomes less plausible than assuming a scribal error. The LXX has ἁπλῶς ἐπιθυμητος ἀναπαύοτα ἐπὶ στόματος σοφοῦ, ἀφρόνες δὲ ἄνδρες καταπίνονται αὐτόν. LXX's ἀναπαύοτα reflects the graphically similar疏散, which makes perfect sense here. My eclectic text of v 20a will read ἀπράβιστος ἤρως ἢ μνημή ἡ προφητική. This maintains MT's בנה rather than LXX's ἐπὶ στόματος. Some LXX variants were just errors. ἐπὶ στόματος makes no sense and is probably a mechanical rendering of בנה, a graphic distortion of בנה. The grammatically correct form would be בנה, but nothing says a variant has to be correct. This case is one of many bad variants in LXX's source text, and these also will be recorded in the apparatus. Given the difficulties of recovering the source text of LXX-Prov, I will accept only those Septuagintal variants that would be worthy conjectural emendations in the absence of the LXX witness.

Of special interest are the LXX variants that represent valid alternative proverbs. In such cases, it may be either the LXX or the MT—or both—that diverged from the ancestral text. But if the later form makes sense, it is a valid variant proverb. The permutation of old sayings is one way that proverbial literature grows. We know this happens repeatedly in MT Proverbs, which contains numerous doublets. A simple example in the LXX vis-à-vis the MT is 14:27: "The fear of the Lord is a fount of life, for turning from the snares of death." The LXX has πρόσταγμα κυρίου – the command of the Lord, where the MT reads 'יהוה ראת "the fear of the Lord." πρόσταγμα must represent מַעֲשָׂה or משוע–probably the latter, under the influence of 13:14a. נחיתת תיבר מַעֲשָׂה. MT's "fear of the Lord" is theologically unobjectionable and a translator would have had no motive to change it to "command." But whichever variant is earlier, I would not adapt MT 14:27 to the LXX any more than I would adapt MT 14:27 to...
MT 13:14. These variants all arise in the developmental process that generates new proverbs.  
I regard LXX-Prov and MT-Prov as different recensions, as Emanuel Tov has argued (1990). More precisely, the LXX is a translation of a recension, that is to say, one that descends from a deliberately reworked Hebrew text, and is not merely a translation of a corrupted and elaborated copy of the MT. Moreover, there is evidence at a few points that the LXX is not directly descended from the MT, but that both share an ancestral text (see, for example, Prov 21:20, discussed below, and Fox 2005: 105f.). Hence each extant version has its own validity, and the LXX should not be collapsed into the MT. I will correct the MT toward the LXX only in the case of mechanical errors. But I will also try to reconstruct the variants behind the LXX.

Regrettably, it is impossible to retrovert the Hebrew of most of the LXX, where it is not identical to the MT. The OHB allows for variant recensions in parallel columns. This will work well when a variant Hebrew is preserved, but I do not see how I can represent the LXX recension in a parallel column, since most of the variants are disputable and in any case must be reconstructed. I will have to confine the retroverted parallel variants to the apparatus and commentary.

3. THE NATURE OF THE TASK

The OHB has an editorial board and principles that will unify its parts. Nevertheless, the Hebrew Bible is not a unity in its origins and subsequent transmission and, as I understand it, the OHB will be honest to the Bible's textual diversity. Each book will be treated separately and distinctly, in accordance with its own nature and problems. 

---

4  For examples of this happening in single-language transmission, see Fox (2005:121-28).
5  H van Rooy, the editor of OHB Ezekiel, has called for some consistency in the way the different volumes treat selection and recording of variants (2004). Consistency of presentation is necessary, because the project is aiming at a text of the Bible. But the degree of unity of method that can or should be achieved remains to be seen. For one thing, different sorts of textual resources are available for each book. For another, selection of variants is inevitably a very individual art. One advantage of the OHB is that it does not pretend to a unity that is impossible to achieve. Each editor's theories and methods will be entirely up-front (literally, in each volume's introduction), and the student will be able to weigh them and compare them with other editors' systems. In this
The thorniest issue is what the eclectic text will represent, to the degree it succeeds. The OHB seeks to reconstruct the archetype of a book, understood as "its earliest inferable textual state." This ideally approaches the *Urtext*, the text-form subsequent to its composition but prior to its corruption. This is a feasible goal for many biblical books, at least as a heuristic guide.

But this goal immediately presents me with a difficulty, because I don't even know what an *Urtext* could mean in the case of Proverbs, hence how it could be represented in the archetype. Hezekiah's collection? The four old collections in chapters 10-29 prior to later additions? But we can hardly exclude chapters 1-9 and 30-31, though they were, in my view, composed and added later. Also, some proverbs in chapters 10-29 may have been inserted before the addition of the opening and closing units. Anyway, in a sense the book of Proverbs is *all* additions, since it is an anthology of anthologies, themselves agglomerations of proverbs, epigrams and poems, some deriving from oral literature, others having antecedents in written wisdom. At what stage do "additions" become "later additions?" In the case of Proverbs, we are dealing with a snowballing text, and the Ur-snowball is not only beyond recovery, it is beyond conceptualization.

Because of such conundrums, I must define my primary goal as reconstructing the Masoretic *hyparchetype*, to use a term introduced to Bible studies by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein (1957). He states that, in many cases at least, the only feasible goal of text criticism is the reconstruction of "primary alternative hyparchetypes" (1957:197f.). There is, however, some fuzziness in his definition. As far as I can tell, he conflates the idea of variant items–specific undecidable variants–with alternate *text-forms*, which are variant texts of a work in its totality which cannot be derived from an extant text-form. This does not work, because, first, undecidability is merely a fact of interpretation, not of textual history. Second, undecidable variants can occur *within* a single textual tradition. And third, differences between true text-forms, such as the MT and the LXX, often are resolvable.

I would use "hyparchetype" as Paul Maas does in his classic handbook on the principles of editing (1956), namely to refer to "reconstructed variant-carriers," that is to say, deviating text-forms that derive from a way, the OHB should help teach methodological sophistication, by sensitizing students to the individuality of text-critical scholarship.

---

6 Kenney (2005). This definition is embraced by the OHB.
single non-extant source text (at some remove) but not from each other. Their relation is horizontal. An entire "reconstructed variant-carrier," or text-form, is a hyparchetype.

The integrity of the hyparchetype is not just a practical matter—which is how Goshen-Gottstein formulated it—but a matter of principle. I would say that hyparchetypes not only can not be collapsed into a single text but should not be, at least not when they represent different additions and deliberate innovations rather than just an accumulation of errors, glosses, etc. Nevertheless, the text of one line of the stemma can legitimately be corrected on the basis of a reading from a parallel line, when it is believed that the corruption emerged later than the divergence of the text-lines. My secondary goal, then, is to reconstruct parts of the LXX-Prov hypertype—a full reconstruction is impossible. Given the exigencies of retroverting the Greek translation of this book, recovering its archetype is feasible only sporadically.

A good model for thinking about the development of Wisdom texts is the Egyptian Wisdom of Ptahhotep. Extent are an early recension ("P"), found in Pap. Prisse ("P") and a later recension ("L"), found in a few incomplete manuscripts. (For examples of recensional changes in Ptahhotep see Fox 2005:121-28.) The L version diverges from the earlier one in numerous ways, usually deliberate, often extensively. The L recension became dominant, and whenever Ptahhotep was quoted in later literature, it was according to the L recension. It would make no sense to "correct" L to the earlier form, except in the case of copyist error.

Defining my goal as the reconstruction of the Masoretic hyparchetype provides some guidelines for deciding what material to excise as secondary. The OHB seeks to identify deliberate revisions and restore the text to a more pristine state. Since I can hardly remove proverbs that are secondary—I can't even determine what they are secondary to—does anything not belong in the eclectic text?

Copyist errors clearly do not. More difficult is the matter of glosses; for example, the one in Prov 5:22a: הָאִשָּׁה הַיְּרֵשָׁה "His (the evildoer's) iniquities will trap him." The phrase הָאִשָּׁה הַיְּרֵשָׁה, absent in the LXX and the Peshitta, is not integrated into the Hebrew syntax and is commonly recognized as an explanatory gloss. Since it was absent from the text when LXX's and MT's lines diverged, I will excise it.

But what about presumptive scribal additions that do exist in the LXX, such as 8:13a: "The fear of the Lord means hating evil." This sentence awkwardly interrupts Lady Wisdom's self-praise and is probably a pietistic insertion intended to counterbalance the possibly amoral
overtones of cunning and shrewdness. But since it belonged to the
common ancestor of the LXX and MT, it was present in the
hyparchetype, and in my role as textual critic I will maintain it. In my role
as literary critic, however, in my commentary on Proverbs, I deleted it
(Fox 2000:265). This raises the question of what I am aiming at as text
critic, and I will discuss this issue below.

There are very few Septuagintal minuses beyond the phrase level, and
even these are probably accidental, such as 1:16, "for their feet run to
harm; they rush to shed blood." The verse is essential to the context and
probably lost in LXX through parablepsis. If I thought that the absence
was original, I would in principle have to move the verse to the apparatus,
since it would not have belonged to the hyparchetype. There are a large
number of LXX pluses, consisting of lines, verses, and even full poems.
These are of considerable interest to the reception-history of the book, but
they are not part of the history of the hyparchetype under consideration
and do not belong in the eclectic edition. Even when I think that they had
a Hebrew basis and that I can retrovert them, I will confine them to the
textual commentary, as I do for Prov 9:12a-12c.

How far back can I go in stripping out conjectured additions? As a
commentator, I remove a number of lines from the main text, such as
Prov 8:13a or 9:12. But, right or wrong, I do not think that such
judgments belong to the task of the text critic, especially when unity of
authorship cannot be presumed from the start. What I would really like to
do is to put such presumptive secondary expansions in parentheses, as I
think the glossator would have done if he had the device available. As it
is, I guess I can mention them in the chapter of commentary.

What I am aiming at is not the Urtext or even the archetype of
Proverbs, but the correct hyparchetype of the Masoretic Proverbs, that is
to say, the proto-Masoretic text. Insofar as the result is accurate, it will
represent a work, as Tanselle defines it: an "ideal verbal construction"
(1989:15). It is very unlikely that there ever was a manuscript that held
this text. That is because changes, deliberate and unintended, were surely
introduced at different times, some even before the later parts of the book
were added.

Hence the text I am aiming at never had physical existence. It is a
construct. It can be defined as the proto-MT as it should have been, what
the authors, conceived as a collectivity (see below) wanted us to read.
This goal is, of course, heuristic, not fully attainable.

This goal is in line with the position formulated by the editorial theorist
and practitioner Thomas Tanselle, notably in his A Rationale of Textual
Criticism (1989). Tanselle distinguishes the "text" from the "work." The work is ideal. The text, properly speaking, exists apart from the documents that are intended to preserve it. Texts go through transmutations; the work has sort of platonic existence, abstracted from any particular textual manifestation. The editor aims to reconstruct the text that best represents the work. This is not a mechanical task, but requires engaged exegesis. "An editor, only through his analysis and understanding of the meaning of the work in the light of his knowledge of the author and his times, will be in a position to use authorial active intention as a basis for editorial choice" (Tanselle 1976:211).

In the 1980s and 1990s, as the author lost his privileged place among literary theorists, editorial theory tended to shift toward a non-intentionalist paradigm. In this conception, the work as a whole exists in diachronicity, in fluctuating and multiple forms, while each text-form is an autonomous "textual moment." This view of text and editing holds considerable interest for biblical text criticism, because the Bible demonstrably exists in temporal extension, and this fact legitimates the production of different types of editions with different goals. The diachronic perspective does not exclude the intentionalist paradigm, but recognizes that this is an editorial choice, not an absolute verity. A Masoretic edition, such as the Jerusalem Crown, would not choose the intentionalist paradigm, because it is oriented not to the moment (or period) of creation but to the time of deliberate finalization by the Ben Asher Masoretes. This was a preservationist, not creative, effort. I choose the intentionalist paradigm because I am aiming at authorship, which to my mind makes sense only as an intentional act.

In the case of Proverbs, authorship is extremely extended and multiplex, residing in innumerable and indeterminable individuals—authors of sayings, collectors and editors, and generations of scribes, some of whom took an active hand in shaping the book. We may think of

---

7 In the summation by Cohen and Jackson, Tanselle says that "the work is a historical act of intention, an ideal and enduring configuration created by an author but embodied (inevitably) in a flawed form" (Cohen and Jackson 1991:106). Texts must also be distinguished from artifacts, that is to say, particular manuscripts and printings, which are records of texts.

8 The presence of scribal expansions is a surmise in the case of Proverbs, but it is demonstrable fact in the cases of Ben Sira and several Egyptian Wisdom books, where a multiplicity of manuscripts allows us to identify scribal expansions with certainty.
the author as a construct comprised of that collectivity. Proverbs is not a haphazard assemblage of bits and pieces, but a deliberate work whose growth was controlled by editors, who shaped the work by selection, choosing to incorporate (or compose) sayings that were pertinent to their ideology, and also, to a degree, by placement, through frequent clustering of sayings on a single topic. Given the complexity of the book's history, this collective authorship cannot be reduced to a "final editor" (who may have been merely a scribe who attached Prov 31:10-31 and who had no further influence on the book's composition). The "collective author" is a personification of an abstraction. But given the high homogeneity of the book's ideology and style, as well as the fact that the successive contributors to the book were aware of and influenced by the earlier compositional levels, collective authorship is a valid way of conceiving of the way the book communicates meaning.

Proverbs is the work of individuals who intended us to understand certain things. I don't know what we can read for—or write for—other than the communication of intention. Indeed, the very existence of speech and writing is a commitment to the recoverability of intention, and this recoverability is constantly confirmed when other people correctly retrieve the intentions we ourselves encode in speech and writing.

The recovery of intention is the essence of interpretation, and interpretation addresses units larger than the variants in question. That is why a careful holistic reading of a document can override typographical errors. If you read a sentence of mine with a silly typo, I hope you will mentally emend the text by reference to the "ideal" of the author's intention that you reconstruct from the wider context. This text may never have existed precisely in a single manuscript, but it is correct. Nothing other than the intended text is worth the reader's time. It is only right to do the same for ancient authors. As Tanselle (1989:92) says,

> Of all the historical activities of textual study, the effort to reconstruct the texts of works as intended by their creators takes us deepest into the thinking of interesting minds that preceded us. We must respect the documents that make our insights possible, but we cannot rest there if we wish to experience the works created by those minds.

The intentionalist paradigm of text editing provides the OHB with a rationale for maintaining Tiberian vocalization in a much earlier

---

9 See Fox (2000:322-30), for a discussion of part of the process.
consonantal text and also for emending the pointing. Whether maintaining or emending the Tiberian vocalization of the copy-text (the Leningradensis), the editor is representing a certain interpretation of the authorial intention. To be sure, in the period relevant to the OHB, the vocalic variant existed only in someone's mind or in a reading tradition, but the intentionalist paradigm makes such mental variants relevant and their representation appropriate. The vocalization represents, ideally, the way the authors would have vocalized the text had they been using the Tiberian phonemic system and vocalic graphemes. This is a stretch, but we face it every time we read the MT.

One perplexing problem is what to do with the Masoretic accents. The problem is present, though hidden, even in diplomatic editions that emend words while ignoring the accents. An eclectic edition, however, cannot escape the fact that the consequence of emending a word, when this affects the syntax, is to undermine the accent system for the verse, or at least the accentual unit. Then the remaining accents in that unit make no sense. Minimally, when a disjunctive is deleted, the subordinate accents of that accentual unit, including the disjunctives, must be removed.

4. MODELS OF EDITORIAL PRACTICE

The modern editor of a biblical book faces a situation similar to what editors of many other works must deal with, and biblical text critics would benefit from giving attention to the theory and practices of text criticism and editing in other fields. I find that Shakespearian editorial practice offers some illustrations of well thought-out approaches to problems familiar to Bible text critics. (Which is not to say that the Shakespearians have solved their problems!) King Lear is an interesting example, because it exists in two significantly divergent forms, the Quarto of 1608 (Q1, slightly edited and reprinted in Q2, 1619), and the Folio of 1623 (F).

Furness's 1880 Variorum King Lear uses the First Folio of 1623 as the copy-text while embedding readings from the Quartos, though the editor believes that overall the Quarto text is far inferior. The Variorum's upper apparatus records all variants not in the eclectic text. There are numerous editions using F as the copy-text and emending by reference to Q, usually with a limited critical apparatus. The important Arden edition (1998) conflates F and Q, embedding in its F copy-text some 300 lines absent in F, while retaining some 110 lines absent from Q (and marking all such passages). Most contemporary Shakespearians, however, oppose
conflation. The dominant view now is that Q and F are (as Bible scholars would say) different recensions, each with its own integrity.\(^\text{10}\)

The Quarto was published from Shakespeare's own foul papers (his working drafts, meant for theater use). This was in 1608, two years after the completion of the play and while the play was still being performed— and constantly adjusted—under Shakespeare's direction. In spite of its proximity to the author, the Q text, especially in its earliest impressions, is severely flawed.\(^\text{11}\) The 1623 Folio (F) differs from Q in significant ways, including major pluses and minuses that bear strongly on the play’s meaning and aesthetics.

Though the path from Q to F is complex and in dispute, the consensus is that the latter is based on Shakespeare's own revisions.\(^\text{12}\) Hence Oxford\(^2\) prints the two versions as two distinct plays. Wells (2000), recognizing the integrity of Q and F, chooses to use Q1 as a copy-text with collations from the "variant states" in other Q printings. Nevertheless, Oxford\(^2\) incorporates certain F readings when Q is certainly corrupt. Weis (1993) sets Q and F on facing pages but corrects both texts as necessary. Halio, most interestingly, published companion volumes, one (1992) based on F, the other (1994) based on Q, each with its own introduction and commentary. Both texts are critical editions and use the other for corrections but are not conflated. Even editors committed to the integrity of the two versions must sometimes correct Q from F or F from Q (Wells 1989:8; Weis 1993:41). This is the approach I would take to Proverbs if the Hebrew base-text of LXX were extant.

All critical editors of *King Lear* are producing text-forms that did not exist previously. They all aim at restoring some phase of Shakespeare's intention, which is imperfectly recorded in several text-states. As far as I can tell, no Shakespearian critical editor merely reproduces a particular printing—Q1b, say—and relegates all variants, even preferred ones, to the apparatus. (That would be the Biblia Hebraica approach.) There are publications that simply reproduce a particular edition for its historical
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\(^{10}\) See Oxford\(^2\): xxxix; Weis (1993:34-40); Wells (2000:3-9, 81-85). The following account is based primarily on Weis (1993:4-7, 34-40) and Halio (1992:58-91).

\(^{11}\) The consistent application of the "lectio difficilior" rule to *Lear* would result in a maximal mess. Likewise in Bible studies (Albrektson 1981).

\(^{12}\) The relation between Q and F calls to mind the relation between LXX-Jer and MT-Jer, as described by Tov (1985) and others, though the revisions in the latter were not authorial.
value, but that is not intended to be critical editing. There is only one Q
fundamentalist editor, G. Holderness (1995), a professor of Cultural
Studies. He deconstructs the critics (whose preference for F, he explains,
entails "a distinct complicity with both authorial intentionality and with a
conservative critical agenda that invests its desires in the surviving male
protagonists of the tragedy"; 1995:41), and he repudiates the practice of
emendation as lacking "philosophical justification" and as
"foreground[ing] the editor at the expense of the text" (1995:9). A similar
resistance to the emendation of the MT is not unknown in Bible studies.

What is more common among Shakespearian editors is to take a base
text, such as Q2 or (more often) F, and edit it, correcting errors by
reference to other documents or, when necessary, by learned conjecture,
and relegating other variants to the apparatus. This is what the OHB will
usually do, mutatis mutandis. In similar fashion, MT-Prov must
sometimes be corrected from LXX-Prov, in spite of the priority of the
former and the integrity of each recension. For other cases, extant
sections of variant Hebrew recensions will be presented in parallel
columns. While the OHB approach is innovative, even radical, in Bible
studies, it is the standard practice among serious Shakespearian editors
and, I believe, in other fields as well.

The Shakespearian example can also help us think about the issue of
the Masoretic accents. Elizabethan punctuation was ambiguous and fluid,
and scribes and printers tended to regard punctuation as their prerogative.
Shakespeare himself punctuated lightly (Oxford²: xlii), since he expected
to be on the spot to prompt the players in their phrasing. One of his
copyists, Ralph Crane, is known to have imposed his own system of
punctuation on the texts he transcribed. Stage directions, act-scene
numeration, and speaker designations were introduced largely in F,
probable at the printer's, and are often wrong. Modern editors typically
try to maintain the accidentals of the best texts, but they are often forced
to change some and add others (Oxford²: xlii; McKerrow 1939:40-43).
The editors do not simply wipe out the punctuation marks in an attempt to
restore the situation in Shakespeare's foul papers or even his fair copies.

The Masoretic accents, like many of the accidentals in the early
Shakespearian editions, were added as an aid to performance. The
Masoretic accents will be retained in the OHB, though this is in a sense
anachronistic, unless emendation makes them meaningless. It is not
expected that the editors will take the liberty of emending accents when
they violate what he or she considers the correct structure of a verse. But
in principle it would be strange to emend the ancient level of the text while holding the medieval level sacrosanct.

5. SUMMARY

I hope to avoid two extremes in preparing OHB-Proverbs. One is the doomed attempt to reconstruct the archetype of Proverbs. The other is the relativistic acceptance of any and every text-form as a "textual moment" of irreducible validity. As for the first extreme, it must be objected that the archetype is a phantom. As for the second, one must query whether, if everything is equally valid for every kind of edition, there is any point in anything other than a Kennicott-Rossi type assemblage, indeed, whether there is sense in any editorial activity at all.

My goal is to reconstruct the text of the proto-Masoretic work while preserving and evaluating all other ancient texts, whether right, wrong, or equally valid, insofar as these can be recovered.

The following appendix is from the planned OHB-Proverbs, including a sample page and the commentary on it. The commentary will go in a separate section of the volume.
Proverbs 9

9:1 ἐκμετάλλευσα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δόμημα τὸ ἐμὸν τιμῆθη.
9:2 ἠκολούθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἁγίας
9:3 τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμνήσθη:
9:4 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:5 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:6 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:7 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:8 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:9 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:10 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:11 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:12 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:13 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:14 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:15 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:16 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:17 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:18 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους

9:1 ἐκμετάλλευσα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δόμημα τὸ ἐμὸν τιμῆθη.
9:2 ἠκολούθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἁγίας
9:3 τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμνήσθη:
9:4 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:5 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:6 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:7 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:8 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:9 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:10 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:11 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:12 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:13 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:14 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:15 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:16 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:17 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:18 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους

9:1 ἐκμετάλλευσα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δόμημα τὸ ἐμὸν τιμῆθη.
9:2 ἠκολούθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἁγίας
9:3 τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμνήσθη:
9:4 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:5 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:6 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:7 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:8 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:9 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:10 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:11 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:12 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:13 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:14 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:15 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:16 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:17 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:18 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους

9:1 ἐκμετάλλευσα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δόμημα τὸ ἐμὸν τιμῆθη.
9:2 ἠκολούθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἁγίας
9:3 τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμνήσθη:
9:4 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:5 ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ ἄγγελον.
9:6 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:7 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:8 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:9 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:10 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:11 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:12 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:13 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:14 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:15 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:16 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:17 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
9:18 ἐπέλεξεν ἐν τῇ πόλει τοὺς ἱλαστέρους
Text-Critical Commentary
Proverbs 9

9:1 הָעַב (or הָעַבָּה) G (καὶ ὑπηρετεῖσθαι) S (וסַחַמ) T (תַּעַבְּר) M (גרפִּית

הָעַב (or הָעַבָּה)): This is one of the very few places where T attests independently to a non-Masoretic reading, since T is neither adjusting to M nor simply transposing S to Western Aramaic. (The lexeme סַחַמ was available in T’s dialect.) The variant הָעַב “has set up” provides a stronger parallel to “building” a house than does M’s “has hewn,” and the pair “build”–“set up” is preferable to the unsequential “hewn”–“set up.”

στύλος: G omits “her” of Ἰωάννης, eliding the possessive pronoun, as often, when the referent is clear.

9:4 ὃς ἐπηκαὶ Syr (טונק) M G (εἶπεν) (voc)

S implicitly vocalizes the verb as 1 sg., γλώσσα and supplies a conjunction. This is preferable to the third person, as understood in M and G. The switch to the third person is awkward within the first-person discourse (“Whoever is callow, let him come over here! Whoever is senseless, to him she says.”) The first person cohortative yields a smoother sentence and conveys volition or determination: “I will surely say to him.”

9:10 εἶς | + stich G

G adds 10α (Rahlfs’s numbering) τὸ γὰρ γνώσας νόμον διανοοῖς ἑστιν ἰγκαθῆς “For to know the law is (the part of) a good intellect.” The stich is reused in LXX-Prov 13:15b (or possibly comes from there). It has the obelus in SyrH, and Lagarde considers it the older translation of MT 10b; sim. CSP. Toy calls it a gloss by a “legalistic scribe,” while Seeligmann (1953: 179) considers it a midrashic expansion on the part of the translator, based on Prov 13:15 and identifying wisdom with study of Torah. The distinctively Greek syntax of διανοοῖς ἑστιν ἰγκαθῆς supports an origin in Greek rather than Hebrew.
9:11 ו מ ו G (τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ τρόπῳ εξπαν) S (σα)  (log)

G's τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ τρόπῳ = והלך. S σα supports והלך independently of G, since S does not follow G's expansive rendering. (Τ’ והלך = S and is original; Τ” והלך adjusts to MT.) The change to third person probably occurred in the Hebrew of proto-G. It was a “logical” adjustment consequent on the insertion of vv 7-10, which interrupt Wisdom’s speech and distance the pronoun from the first-person antecedent. (On the compositional history, see PAB 306-309). G's τῷ τρόπῳ treats והלך broadly, understanding והלך to refer to the type of behavior expressed in v 10.

G’s fut. pass. προστεθῆσεται (“will be added”) treats והלך as a passive (or possibly reflects והלך). Ehrlich, BHS, and many, would emend to והלך. This emendation, like G’s translation, remedies the lack of a subject but does not explain M’s orthography. The author of M 9:11 mechanically combined phrases from earlier chapters, including 3:2, where the verb והלך has “my teaching/precepts” in v 1 as its subject. The passive is an improvement but is not the original.

9:12 fn] + 12a-c G

12a-c. An addition in G, part of which is based on a Hebrew text. It remonstrates against trusting in deceits, by which foreign doctrines and beliefs are probably intended. What one should rely on is true wisdom (3:18), which has been granted to Israel. For the interpretation, see further PAB.

12a δες ἑρείδεται ἐπὶ ψεῦδεσιν, σύν τοι ποιμανεὶ ἄνέμους
12b ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς διώκεται ὑρνεα πετόμενα (Gδ lacks δ’).
12b* ἀπέλιπεν γὰρ ὁ δῶς τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμπελώνος,
12b ὁ τοὺς δὲ ἄξονας τοῦ ἰδίου γεωργίου πεπλάνηται.
12c διαπορεύεται δὲ δι’ ἀνόδου ἔρημου
12c* καὶ γὴν διατεταχμένην ἐν διψοδεσιν,
12c* συνάγει δὲ χερσὶν ἀκαρπίαν.

12a He who supports himself on deceits – he will shepherd the winds.
12b and he will pursue a flying bird.
12b* For he has abandoned the roads of his own vineyard,
12b and has strayed <from> the paths of his own field.
12c He traverses a waterless desert.
12a and a land assigned to droughts.
12c and he gathers barrenness with (his) hands.

The Hebrew of 12a-b can be retroverted approximately to the following:

12a וְהָרַכְתָּ בֵּן בֵּית וַיֶּלֶךְ אָרֶץ
12b וְרָדְתָּ אֵלֶמֶר וַיִּשְׁמַעְתָּ
12c וְיָבָעְרָה רֶדֶף רָדֶף
12d אֲנָאָשִׁים שֵׁרָדַה שִׁית

The evidence for a Hebrew Vorlage in 12a-b is as follows:

1. In the Hebrew Proverbs, כּוֹדֵע always means “grasp,” “hold” (3:18; 4:4; 5:5; 22; 11:16 [2x]; 28:17; 29:23; 31:19). The meaning that G knows for this verb is, however, “lean on” or “support oneself on,” as in Rabbinic Hebr. The rendering “supports himself on deceits” makes sense in and of itself. Nevertheless, an underlying Hebrew that was supposed to mean “he who grasps deceit” fits the imagery better, because it implies an active attempt to get something, which is a type of “pursuit.” (πομακεῖ = ἡρεῖν = “pursue” // רדפ), whereas “support oneself on” is static.

2. κοῦσε δὲ δοξονος is an etymologizing translation of מנהיגים (or מנהיג), understood as “axles,” hence, pars pro toto, “wagon”; cf. 2:9, 18. An original Greek composition would have used a more usual word for paths.

3. The middle πενελόκνιτακτα + accus. is unnatural Greek. This verb in mid./pass. can govern the accus. of place and mean “wander about in” (LSJ 1411a), but that would not make sense here, since the man in question has left his proper territory. G 12b looks like a mechanical rendering of מנהיגים שרד שרים. Hebrew, however, requires the preposition ב when שרד means “wander from.” Thus, while the awkwardness in the Greek points to a Hebrew Vorlage, we must posit that the latter resulted by haplography from מנהיגים שרד שרים.

It is difficult to reconstruct a Heb Vorlage for 12c, esp. for stich 7. The description of the desert is influenced by G-her 2:6b; note especially ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν

---

1 Or כּוֹדֵע, כּוֹדֵע, understood as a headless relative clause.
2 The standard rendering in G-Prov is by a form of ἐρήμετος, which basically means “support” (3:18; 4:4; 5:5; 11:16); 29:23; 31:19), ἀφιγγεῖον; “be tied up,” used in 5:22, is based on the context, which describes being caught in ropes. In 11:16, ἐρήμηπε should be emended to ἐρήμετος. S ἐρήμηπε supports the latter, because S follows G in this verse.
γῇ ἅπείρῳ καὶ ὀβότῳ, ἐν γῇ ἁνύόρῳ καὶ ἁκύρῳ in that verse. Prov 9:12c is probably an inner-Greek expansion of v. 12b. Its purpose is to teach that the deceitful man has chosen a barren, fruitless land in place of his rightful field and vineyard, that is to say, his Jewish religious culture.

9:16 προτεῖν S (τριτον) Ἔραθον M G (παρακελεύομαι λέγουσα; expan) (voc)

As in 9:4, S’s first person cohortative fits the first-person context better than the third person. G παρακελεύομαι λέγουσα is expansive.

9:18 fin ] + 18a-d G

G adds four verses, found also in S:

18a ἄλλα ἀποπηδήσουν, μὴ ἐγχρονίσῃς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ

18b ὑπὸς γὰρ διαβήσῃ ὕδωρ ἄλλωτρον

18c ἀπὸ δὲ ὑδάτως ἄλλωτρον ἀπάθεος

18d ἵνα πολὺν ζῆσης χρόνον,

18a But get away; tarry not in the place, nor direct your eye toward her.

18b For thus you may pass through strange water and cross over a strange river.

18c From strange water keep away, and from a strange spring drink not,

18d so that you may live a long time, and years of life be added to you.

A Greek origin is likely for this addition, since it is aimed at a diaspora audience. It admonishes Jews to avoid intimate contact with the surrounding foreign culture (see PAB). Evidence for a Greek origin is that 9:18d is based on 9:11b in the Gk. Since the addition interprets the foolish woman in a way not found elsewhere in G-Prov, it was probably inserted at a later stage than the original translation. S shows clear dependence on G here and does not witness to a Hebrew text. In 18a ἀπειρω ἑικε imitates one of the senses of ἀποπηδήσουν. S reformulates v 18d under the influence of G v 11.
Abbreviations and brief bibliographical references for Proverbs:


(References are ad loc. to the Commentary and Textual Notes.)


---

**Selected Sigla and Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>retroversion from translation document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>reconstructed or conjectural reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.c</td>
<td>irremediable corruption (e.g., ‘םָּשָׁשֵׁה’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>entry in apparatus (circlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>non-M reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>uncertain letter in Qumran text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>fragmentary reading in Qumran text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first (second, etc.) occurrence in a verse (superscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>changed to (as in mod or other scribal change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>see discussion in text-critical commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>omission of text in cases of homoioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>root of linguistic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≈</td>
<td>approximately equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>addition (in new edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antic</td>
<td>anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assim</td>
<td>assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aur</td>
<td>aural variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cj</td>
<td>conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conv</td>
<td>converse translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr</td>
<td>scribal correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crpp</td>
<td>corrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial</td>
<td>dialectal variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dittog</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div</td>
<td>word misdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbl</td>
<td>double translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed</td>
<td>edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal</td>
<td>equally plausible as primary reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err-explic</td>
<td>erroneous explication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exeg</td>
<td>exegetical revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expan</td>
<td>expansion in translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explic</td>
<td>explication (or explicating gloss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fin</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foll</td>
<td>following lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gram</td>
<td>change of grammatical feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graph</td>
<td>graphic error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haplo</td>
<td>hapigraphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoi</td>
<td>homoiarcton, homoioteleuton, homoiomeson, homoiologon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm</td>
<td>harmonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>init</td>
<td>initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>revision motivated by the logic of context or syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meta</td>
<td>metathesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg</td>
<td>variant reading written in margin, e.g., Tg(^{(\text{mg})})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.l.</td>
<td>a misconstrual of matres lectionis by translator or punctuator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod</td>
<td>linguistic modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod-m.l.</td>
<td>modernization of matres lectionis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral</td>
<td>moralization (a subset of exeg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms(s)</td>
<td>manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mult</td>
<td>multiple occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near-dittog</td>
<td>dittography of graphically similar letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near-haplo</td>
<td>hapigraphy of graphically similar letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>change of grammatical number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paleo</td>
<td>Paleo-Hebrew script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>first hand (prima manus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prev</td>
<td>previous lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prps</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rab</td>
<td>Rabbinic citation, noted in text-critical commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re</td>
<td>regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rem</td>
<td>reminiscence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sim</td>
<td>similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syn</td>
<td>substitution of synonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theol</td>
<td>theologically motivated change (a subset of exeg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transp</td>
<td>transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v(v)</td>
<td>verse(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vid</td>
<td>seemingly (videtur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>difference of vocalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>weakening of guttural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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